Remarks

Claims 1-29 are at issue. Claims 1-11, 13-15, 17-23 & 25-29 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Blinn et al (USPN 5897622). Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn et al view of Jamtgaard et al (US 6430624). Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn et al view of Povilus (US 5740425). Claims 12 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 1 requires a first and second hierarchical data scheme and the claim now defines a hierarchical data scheme as a scheme that groups data and its context. This definition can be found in the specification at page 2, lines 19-24. Note that the list of examples of hierarchical data structures does not include HTML as used by Blinn et al. Blinn converts database information into an HTML page. HTML is a presentation or display language not a data structure. As a result HTML combines a tag with data, however the tag explains how the data is presented on a computer screen, not the context of the data. For instance, <bold>\$9.99</bold> tells the browser (client) to bold the data, e.g., \$9.99, but it does not tell you that \$9.99 is a price. Clearly, Blinn does not covert data in a first hierarchical data scheme to a second hierarchical data scheme. Claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-4, 8, & 10-11 are allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 5 requires the template to be an eXtensible Markup Language (XML) document. A computer search of Blinn shows that he never mentions XML or extensible markup language. Clearly Blinn does not have an XML template. Claim 5 is allowable.

Claim 6 requires the template have an XML document type definition. A computer search of Blinn shows that he never mentions XML or extensible markup language. Clearly Blinn does not have an XML document type definition. Claim 6 is allowable.

Claim 9 further defines the group of items that fit the second hierarchical data scheme. In the Examiner's analogy to Blinn the second hierarchical data structure would be the HTML. HTML is not in the list of claim 9. Claim 9 is clearly allowable over the prior art.

Claims 14-15, 17 are allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 18 requires a static extensible markup language template. A computer search of Blinn shows that he never mentions XML or extensible markup language. Clearly Blinn does not have an XML template. Claim 18 is allowable.

Claims 19 & 23-25 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 18.

Claim 26 requires a sample extensible markup language file. A computer search of Blinn shows that he never mentions XML or extensible markup language. Clearly Blinn does not have a sample XML file. Claim 26 is allowable.

Claims 27-29 are allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Prompt reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

(Vandersluis)

Ву

Dale B. Halling

Attorney for the Applicant Registration No. 38,170 Phone: (719) 447-1990

Fax: (719) 447-198

I hereby certify that an <u>Amendment</u> is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on:

Date

Signature (Dale B. Halling)